## Interview Summary

Application No. 09/500,254

Gary J. Portka

Applicant(8):

Examiner

Art Unit

2188

Mattausch



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):	
(1) Gary J. Portka (PTO) (3)	
Date of Interview Jan 30, 2003	
Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's  Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes,	
Claim(s) discussed: 1	
Identification of prior art discussed:  Hubis, U.S. Patent 6,321,298 B1; Gujral et al., U.S. Patent 6,223,260 B1; F	Hamaguchi et al., U.S. Patent 6,021,472
Agreement with respect to the claims f)  was reached. g)  was not	reached. h)□ N/A.
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what wany other comments:	
The parties discussed the possible distinctions between the present claims at	nd the prior art. Examiner opined that the
claims as argued might define over the prior art of record, but that a further	search would be required.
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendavailable, a summary thereof must be attached.)	examiner agreed would render the claims dments that would render the claims allowable is
i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the	substance of the interview (if box is checked).
Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REFINCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.0 already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW. SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview records.)	4). If a reply to the last office action has IEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE
	_
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.	Examiner's signature, if required